

they lack the same or corresponding technical features. More particularly, the Examiner has contended that, in the invention of Group II, the decrypting of the message only necessitates the decryption of the renewed key, while the invention of Group I necessitates the decryption of all the keys in the tree. The Examiner has further contended that the invention of Group III does not necessitate any encrypted message or method of decrypting such a message.

In response to the restriction requirement, applicants hereby elect to prosecute Group I covering claims 40-51 and 68-79 in this application. Accordingly, claims 52-67 stand withdrawn from consideration in the present application without prejudice to applicants' right to file one or more divisional applications directed thereto.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this response, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: December 29, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Robert B. Cohen

Registration No.: 32,768

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant